

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Case No. 03-0309-CR-W-HFS |
| |) | |
| DONALD ADKINS, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

MEMORANDUM TO THE PARTIES

The Probation Office reports a problem in transferring jurisdiction over supervision to California, as defendant requests. It is my understanding that at a hearing earlier this year I recommended such a transfer, based on defendant's wish to move there. I also understand that the Probation Office in California is unwilling to accept jurisdiction without a continuing right to visit defendant's residence (and automobile I suppose). Such a right of reasonable visitation is frequently used here as a condition of supervised release.

I have no control over conditions of release that the Probation personnel in California may require as a condition of accepting jurisdiction. If defendant still wishes to move to California he will need to consent to conditions requested by the Probation Office there.*

/s/ Howard F. Sachs
HOWARD F. SACHS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

October 24, 2006

Kansas City, Missouri

*I understand defendant has asked to “see the judge”. We can schedule a hearing but I am satisfied that would not be helpful. There is no duty to assume jurisdiction in California, and thus the people there can impose their own terms. In any event, the request does not seem unreasonable.